

1-24-2002

## Faculty Senate Resolution 02-04

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/senate-pubs>

---

### Recommended Citation

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College, "Faculty Senate Resolution 02-04" (2002). *LSU Faculty Senate Publications*. 288.  
<http://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/senate-pubs/288>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Faculty Senate Publications by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gcoste1@lsu.edu](mailto:gcoste1@lsu.edu).

## Contracts for Instructors and General Librarians

**Whereas**, the University employs about 400 full–time Instructors and General Librarians with an average eight years of service; and

**Whereas**, these faculty members perform essential functions, and many make careers of serving the University in these ranks; and

**Whereas**, the University employs these faculty members mostly by appointments to a one–year term, even though Permanent Memorandum 23 of the LSU System (January 22, 2001) provides only the restriction that such employees "do not earn tenure and are appointed for a specified term," and Section 2–7 of the Bylaws and Regulations for the LSU Board of Supervisors (June 1, 2001) provides only the restriction that they "shall be appointed for a specified term and shall not be considered for indeterminant tenure;" and

**Whereas**, we believe that after a person serves full–time in one of these ranks for an extended period, the continuation of such employment should entail and imply both (1) a finding of highly competent job performance and (2) a decision to provide more reliable and predictable employment than is indicated by an appointment for one year at a time; and

**Whereas**, some of the units that employ Instructors or General Librarians already operate in accord with that belief, by means of procedures and understandings which are recognized only at the unit level; and

**Whereas**, Objective 4.6 of the LSU Planning Document (Release 2.0, October 15, 2001) is "to provide promotional opportunities and multi–year contracts to outstanding faculty with non–tenurable appointments;"

**Therefore be it Resolved**, that the Faculty Senate adopts the following three positions:

(1) We recommend that the University adopt the following policy, hereinafter referred to as the "New Policy," to take effect, after due notice and preparation, at some time in the near future:

- Full–time Instructors and General Librarians employed beyond six consecutive years of service, other than those who are given notice that they will not be reappointed after the end of the seventh year, must be appointed to a four–year rolling contract, that is, a four–year contract subject every year to either a one–year extension or a three–year notice of non–renewal. Promotion to the status of a four–year rolling contract must be approved and recognized at the University level, and will entail a promotional raise. A rigorous

review and a finding of highly competent job performance will be necessary conditions for such a promotion.

(2) We confirm our recognition of the following facts:

- It is within the province of the units that employ Instructors or General Librarians, and of the offices to which they report, to make the determinations as to how many of the positions in question will exist, and as to what the job requirements and job descriptions will be.
- Those determinations must respond to fluctuating needs and conditions.
- Beyond the terms of contracts in force, the University has no obligations to renew appointments in these ranks.

(3) Assuming that the Provost approves the New Policy in principle, we ask that the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee jointly appoint a Special Committee on the Ranks of Instructor and General Librarian. The Committee membership should include someone holding one of the ranks, and should also include representation from some of the employing units. The Committee should be charged as follows:

1. To survey the employing units' existing statements of policy and procedure, or such new ones as the units may develop within a reasonable time.
2. To achieve an understanding of the full range of current practices, and of the problems and questions that may arise in the transition to the New Policy.
3. To make recommendations to the Provost about the transition. The transition should, in every reasonable way, recognize the attainments of existing Instructors and General Librarians and honor the advice of the employing units.
4. To recommend changes to PS-36 and/or other Policy Statements so that for managing the ranks of Instructor and General Librarian, and in particular for implementing the New Policy, we will have only such University-wide regulations as are really and truly necessary;
5. As far as is reasonable, in designing such regulations, to strive for brevity and restraint; to maintain the prerogatives and the flexibility of the employing units; and to rely upon the policy statements of those units to specify conditions and procedures.
6. To consider making provision for a second, later, University-recognized promotion-step for the ranks.
7. To study and take into consideration the concerns and points of view represented by Chapter III and other pertinent parts of the PS-36 draft which is before the Faculty Senate during this academic year.
8. To report to the Faculty Senate by the end of calendar year 2002 or as soon as possible thereafter.

## Frequently Asked Questions

1. Why should the Committee take till the end of 2002 to report? --"Assuming that the Provost approves the New Policy in principle," the employing units should be allowed adequate time to revise or develop their policy statements. The Committee should look at these policy statements before making its recommendations regarding University-wide regulations.
2. What about titles, like "Instructor I", "Instructor II?" --The Resolution makes no mention of new titles. The Committee can consider whether new titles need to be established on a University-wide basis.
3. Why do we need a new, specialized committee for this job? --The Resolution assures that the new, specialized Committee will include representation of the ranks, and of departments that employ the ranks. It gives definite instructions to the Committee to achieve an understanding of the wide variety of existing policies, practices, and problems on campus., and then to act with restraint in proposing University-wide regulation. Of course, it's possible that this job could be left to the existing PS-36-draft-revision committee, but perhaps they have enough to do and would be just as happy to see this matter separated off.
4. How does the Resolution depart from the PS-36 draft as it now stands? --In many ways. One important way: By passing this Resolution, the Senate would take a definite position about multi-year contracts, with a firm mandate; whereas the PS-36 draft would allow a wide variety of practices with regard to the use of multi-year contracts.
5. Why FOUR-YEAR contracts? Why not three-year or five-year? --No compelling reason. Three, four, and five have been mentioned in various contexts, like the 1999 report of the Commission on the status of academic ranks. The choice of "four" adopts the mean, and it allows room for 2- and 3-year contracts, should those be desired in some units for use prior to the promotion-step.